

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VIII

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 10, 1914

No. 2

THE USE OF INTERPRETERS BY THE TEN THOUSAND AND BY ALEXANDER¹

In ancient history no military expeditions are more interesting than the campaign of the Ten Thousand and the conquests of Alexander the Great. As we read that fascinating narrative of Xenophon, we follow the march of the army with a keen interest; we wish Cyrus good fortune; at the battle of Cunaxa we mourn the death of our hero; our indignation is roused at the treachery of the Persians; and then we are full of anxiety for the retreating Ten Thousand. The expedition failed in its object, but it revealed the inherent weakness of the Persian Empire and paved the way for the Macedonian conquest. Presently we follow the victories of Alexander across Asia Minor, down into Egypt, then eastward across Mesopotamia into Persia, then into the remote provinces of the Great King, and finally into distant India. The superiority of the Macedonian phalanx has been proved, but still more important is the Hellenizing of the East and the consequent shift of learning to Alexandria and Pergamum.

That the Greeks on these expeditions had to deal with people of different languages from their own and that communication with the foreigners was often difficult is, however, a circumstance which may easily escape our notice. The Greeks apparently were not gifted as practical linguists, and as a rule learned no language but their own. As for foreign tongues, they despised both them and those that spoke them; to the Hellenic mind all foreigners were barbarians. These differences of language were overcome, our authorities tell us, by the use of interpreters, as we might readily suppose if we chanced to think upon the subject. The purpose of the present paper is to call attention to the extent to which linguists are known to have been employed in these two expeditions. Doubtless the Greeks and the Macedonians used intermediaries more frequently than our authorities would lead us to think. Likewise Caesar in his account of the Gallic War mentions but few occasions on which he used interpreters. Yet, as Professor Rolfe points out in his article, Did Liscus Speak Latin?, in The Classical Journal 7. 126 ff., Caesar must have made constant use of interpreters in dealing with the Gauls, as is shown by the word *cotidianis* in B. G. 1.19.3.

Xenophon himself frequently refers in interesting ways to interpreters of Greek and Persian. When Epyaxa visited Cyrus the Younger, he wished to show her his Greek mercenaries. That he might display them in action, he sent them the order to advance as in battle; this order was communicated through his professional interpreter Pigres (Anab. 1.2.17). Yet he did not always employ this man; for we read later (1.4.16) that he sent Glus to express his pleasure to Menon and his men who had crossed the Euphrates, at the time when the rest of the mercenaries, being angry at Cyrus, refused to advance. It is possible also that Cyrus himself knew Greek; for in Anab. 1.7.2 we hear that he harangued and encouraged his Greek generals and captains. Here Xenophon does not say anything about an interpreter, unless he assumes as a matter of course that one was employed and so proceeds without making mention of the fact. Likewise, in Anab. 1.8.15, Xenophon and Cyrus apparently have no difficulty in conversing without an intermediary. Cyrus did not understand the watchword before the battle, but probably it was not spoken very distinctly and so he simply heard a murmur or noise passing through the ranks.

At this point the question may rise in our minds how the Greek general Clearchus knew what was going on at the trial of Orontas (1.6.4 ff.). When that traitor was brought to trial, Cyrus summoned into his tent seven Persian nobles and Clearchus. No one else is mentioned as having been present. The trial was of course conducted in Persian. Yet the Greek Clearchus, at Cyrus's request, was the first to pronounce his verdict. If he did not understand Persian, either Cyrus or one of the nobles had to interpret the proceedings for him. Clearchus knew perfectly well what was going on, since he reported Cyrus's speech and the verdict to his friends. Yet Xenophon fails to state in what language the Hellenic general was addressed or in what tongue he pronounced his judgment. It seems reasonable, however, to assume that Cyrus or some one else of those present acted as translator. We have no evidence that Clearchus had an opportunity to learn Persian. Once, when in exile (1.1.9; 2.6.4), he took refuge with Cyrus, from whom he received ten thousand darics. With this money he raised an army, and, using the Chersonese as a base of operations, carried on warfare in behalf of the Hellenes. Thus, though he was a very close friend of

¹ This article was written while its author was holding a Harrison Research Fellowship in Indo-European Philology at the University of Pennsylvania.

Cyrus, it appears that, prior to his enlistment under the young satrap, all his life was spent under Hellenic surroundings. If he ever learned any Persian, it was probably merely a command of the language for military purposes during the famous march into the country of the Great King.

On account of the importance of the Greeks in Asia Minor and through his close relations with them, it seems plausible that a man in Cyrus's station knew their language, at least to a certain extent. It is known (*Quintus Curtius* 5.11.4) that Darius III had no slight knowledge of Greek and that he was able to converse with Hellenes in their own language. Now, probably, the brother of Artaxerxes Mnemon came into more direct and personal contact with Greeks than did any Persian monarch, and so it seems very reasonable to assume that the young satrap had an acquaintance with the Hellenic tongue. If this was not the case, we seem obliged to assume that the Greek general Clearchus knew some Persian, at least the Persian of the army; for in *Anabasis* 1.8.12 we are told that, before the battle of Cunaxa, Cyrus passed the army in review, accompanied by his interpreter Pigres and by three or four others. Yet Xenophon expressly states that Cyrus, apparently Cyrus personally, shouted to Clearchus and ordered him to attack the Persian center. Yet, even if Cyrus could not employ Greek adequately to harangue his mercenary officers, it is probable that his command of the language was sufficient to enable him to use it for the issuance of orders to the army. Therefore, though he may perhaps have given his order to Clearchus in Persian, instead of in Greek, neither alternative can be definitely proved. It seems more likely, however, that he spoke Greek to his Hellenic captain. At the same time, he may have used his interpreter in conversing with Greeks where his position as satrap required him to speak Persian as a matter of dignity², or where the subject under discussion exceeded his knowledge of the Hellenic tongue.

We may wonder whether Tissaphernes knew Greek. After the battle of Cunaxa, he came from the King, and, when the Greek generals met him, he began the discourse, speaking through an interpreter³ (*Anab.* 2.3.17). He said that he wished to lead them back in safety to their own country, and considered it a privilege by which he would win gratitude from the Ten Thousand and from all Hellas. Since the King wished to know why they had marched against him,

²Roman provincial governors generally used interpreters. In fact Valerius Maximus tells us (2.2.2) that it was a matter of principle to use them whether they were necessary or not: *quo scilicet Latinae vocis honos per omnes gentes venerabilior diffunderetur. Nec illis <the magistrates> dearent studia doctrinae, sed nulla non in re pallium togae subici debere arbitrabantur.*

³We do not know whether this intermediary was a Persian or a Greek. Tissaphernes, however, had one Greek, Phalinus, on his staff and held him in great esteem. The day after the battle at Cunaxa (*Anab.* 2.1.7 ff.), messengers came from the King and Tissaphernes, demanding the unconditional surrender of the Ten Thousand. Phalinus was the only one among these heralds that was a Greek. Probably he delivered the message; at any rate, he had a long conversation with the Hellenic officers after the King's wishes were made known.

Tissaphernes counselled them to give a moderate answer so that it would be easier for him to carry out his design, if he should obtain from the King any favors in behalf of the Greeks. The Hellenes retired and took counsel; when they gave their reply, Clearchus was their spokesman. Xenophon does not inform us whether the Greeks employed an interpreter or not. It is possible that Tissaphernes had a knowledge of colloquial Greek merely, and used the intermediary because he represented the King and so felt that it was incumbent upon him to speak the official language as a matter of dignity. Or he may have understood Greek without being able to speak it very fluently. In either case, he could have understood the remarks of Clearchus without the services of a translator. Possibly Tissaphernes knew no Greek and Xenophon simply overlooks the use of the interpreter who translated the speech of the Greek. Later on, at the request of Clearchus (*Anab.* 2.5.1 ff.), they had a conference; here no intermediary is mentioned. If Tissaphernes knew Greek and no interpreter was used, he spoke that tongue on this occasion because Clearchus had made the overtures. In this case, he was not a legate from Artaxerxes, and so could be less formal. Possibly here also Tissaphernes, whether he could speak Greek or not, used an intermediary, though Xenophon fails to mention the fact. It is hardly likely that Clearchus spoke Persian at either conference.

If Tissaphernes could not speak or understand Greek, he was not the only Persian of importance that was thus handicapped. In the time of Alexander the Great, a Persian by the name of Bessus was ignorant of Greek and had to use an interpreter. *Quintus Curtius* (5.11.1 ff.) gives this instance in relating the incident of Patron, the commander of the Greeks in the service of Darius. For this man, foreseeing the design of Bessus to assassinate the King, followed Darius's chariot and watched for an opportunity to address him. Bessus, mistrusting him, kept close to the chariot. But Patron, having waited for a considerable time, and hesitating between fidelity and fear, kept his eyes fixed on the King, who eventually sent one of his eunuchs to inquire whether he had anything to say. He replied that he had, but that he wished to speak without a witness. So he was ordered to draw near, and, as Darius had no slight knowledge of Greek, Patron spoke without an interpreter, asking that he with his Greeks might form the royal bodyguard. Although Bessus was ignorant of the Greek language, he was afraid that Patron had informed against him, but he was relieved of his anxiety when the conversation was related to him by an interpreter.

After this digression, let us again return to the advance of the Ten Thousand. Cyrus had both Greeks and Persians in his army, and it was therefore necessary to make announcements in both languages. An instance of this is mentioned just as the King's army was approaching that of Cyrus: Pategyas, a Persian, a member of Cyrus's personal staff, came

galloping up (Anab. 1.8.1) and shouted, both in Greek and in Persian, to every one he met, that the King was coming with a large army ready for battle.

Even if Cyrus had an interpreter or several of them, his Greek soldiers also had their own linguist, who apparently was a professional, since the use of the definite article points him out as a particular individual. In Anabasis 2.5.35, this linguist is mentioned as saying that he saw and recognized the brother of Tissaphernes with Ariaeus, Artaozus, and Mithridates. When the Persians asked that a Greek general or captain come forth to hear the message from the King, Cleanor the Orchomenian, Sophaenetus the Stymphalian, and Xenophon the Athenian went out with their guards. When they were within earshot, Ariaeus announced the death of Clearchus and said that the King wished them to surrender their arms. Both Xenophon and Cleanor spoke to Ariaeus. How they carried on the conversation, Xenophon does not say. It is very probable that the interpreter mentioned above was the intermediary and that he recognized the brother of Tissaphernes while he was with the generals on duty. Xenophon, strange to say, makes mention of the professional interpreter, not as translating, but as recognizing one of the enemy. Could Ariaeus speak Greek? In Anabasis 2.2.7 ff., when the Greeks and Ariaeus and his officers made their solemn covenant, no interpreter is mentioned. Clearchus and the barbarian general also had a conversation and apparently had no difficulty in understanding each other. Possibly this again is one of the many cases where the historians neglect to mention the details of overcoming differences of languages.

During their retreat, interpreters were used quite frequently by the Ten Thousand; but that does not necessarily imply that they were accompanied by professionals able to speak the various languages and dialects of Persia which they met. Under the influence of the Persian rule, Persian, as the official language, was doubtless known by some people in every province; whatever tongue the people of a district spoke, an interpreter speaking standard Persian might make himself understood.

We should not expect Xenophon to have an interpreter able to speak the dialect of the Carduchians; and yet through an interpreter (Anab. 4.2.18) he succeeded in negotiating a truce with them and in asking back the bodies of the dead. But the language of the modern Kurds is closely allied to Persian; and, if we are right in assuming that the *Kαρδούχοι* are the ancestors of the Kurds, in those days a Persian-speaking interpreter might perhaps have managed to communicate even with the Carduchians speaking only their mother tongue.

As the Greeks passed through Western Armenia, Tiribazus, the lieutenant-governor and friend of the King, rode up to the Hellenes with a body of cavalry and, sending forth an interpreter (Anab. 4.4.5), stated that he desired to speak with their commanders. The

generals decided to hear what he had to say; advancing within speaking distance, they asked what he wanted. Tiribazus replied that he wished to make a treaty with them in accordance with which he would abstain from injuring the Greeks if the latter should not burn the houses, but should merely take such provisions as they needed. The proposal satisfied the generals and a treaty was thus, through the interpreter, successfully negotiated.

In Armenia, one day about dusk, Cheirisophus reached a village (Anab. 4.5.10) and met some women and girls who were drawing water from the spring outside the city wall. These asked the Greeks who they were. Through the interpreter (the Greek uses the definite article, showing that this interpreter was a professional accompanying the army), reply was made in Persian that they were on their way from the King to the satrap. The women replied that the satrap was not at home, but was a parasang farther on. Xenophon does not say that the women spoke Persian, although he tells us that the interpreter did so. Even if the Armenian women did not speak pure Persian—and Persian was certainly not their mother tongue—the interpreter had no difficulty in conversing with them.

Later in the course of their march in Armenia, they were hospitably received in certain villages (Anab. 4.5.33 ff.). When Xenophon and the chief of one of the villages came to the division of Cheirisophus, they found the men feasting in their quarters, garlanded with wisps of hay, while Armenian boys in barbaric costumes were playing the part of waiters. The Greeks had to point out to the boys, just as to deaf and dumb persons, what they were to do. As soon as Xenophon and Cheirisophus had greeted each other, they obtained information from the village chieftain by means of their interpreter, who spoke the Persian language. Here Xenophon again uses the definite article, showing that the individual filled a certain office in the army; probably he is the linguist mentioned above. Perhaps the chieftain, though an Armenian, being a man of some consequence and having official occasion to use Persian, had learned the language of the rulers.

Later (Anab. 4.8.4), during their retreat, the Ten Thousand simply by accident happened to have among them a person who could speak the language of the country through which they passed. As the Macrones obstructed their march, one of the peltasts came to Xenophon and said that he had been a slave at Athens and that he wished to tell him that he understood the speech of these people. 'I think', said he, 'this is my native country, and if there is no objection, I will have a talk with them'. 'No objection at all', replied Xenophon; 'pray do, and ask them first who they are'. In answer to this question they said that they were Macrones. 'Well, then', said Xenophon, 'ask them why they are drawn up in battle and want to fight with us'. They answered, 'Because you are invading our country'. The generals bade him say that they

intended no harm, but had been at war with the King and were now returning to Hellas, and that all they wanted was to reach the sea. The Macrones asked whether they were willing to give pledges to that effect. The Greeks replied that they were willing both to give and to receive them. Then the Macrones gave a barbarian lance to the Greeks and they in turn a Hellenic lance to the barbarians. These the Macrones said would serve as pledges, and both sides called the gods to witness. In the other passages referred to in this paper, the use of the interpreter is simply mentioned, but here the author takes the pains to tell us how the linguist was prompted for every sentence that he spoke. It would, indeed, be impossible for a man to make a long speech and then expect the translator to repeat from memory the same words without errors or omissions.

A little later (Anab. 5.4.4), the Hellenes continued their retreat from Cerasus to the frontiers of the Mossynoecians. A conference of the Mossynoecian chiefs and the generals of the Greeks was then arranged by Timesitheus of Trapezus, who was the proxenus of the Mossynoeci. Xenophon made a speech which was interpreted by Timesitheus. An alliance was then made with the Mossynoecians against their hostile subjects to the West.

In narrating the later fortunes of Cyrus's mercenaries, Xenophon informs us that interpreters of Greek and Thracian were used. When they were on European soil, Xenophon desired to speak with the Thracian chieftain Seuthes (Anab. 7.2.19), and therefore sent the interpreter whom he happened to have with him, ordering him to inform Seuthes that Xenophon was there and desired a conference with him. About two hundred peltasts then came and conducted Xenophon to the Thracian, and a conference followed. Probably they used an interpreter also at the meeting, although as we shall see, Seuthes understood Greek fairly well. That does not imply, however, that he could speak the language with any degree of fluency and, although he might have followed without help all or almost all that Xenophon said, it is most likely that he himself spoke Thracian.

At the banquet that he gave to the Hellenic officers, he did not, however, understand a remark that the gourmand Arystas made to the cup-bearer (Anab. 7.3.24-25). As the latter could speak Greek, he interpreted the words to his royal master.

Subsequently Seuthes sent Abrozelmes, his private interpreter (Anab. 7.6.43), to Xenophon, urging him to stay behind with one thousand hoplites and declaring that he would fulfill other promises in their previous agreement. He also added that, if Xenophon should fall into the clutches of the Lacedaemonians, Thibron was certain to put him to death. But the omens were unfavorable and Xenophon refused.

Now, having traced the experiences of the Ten Thousand, let us follow the expedition of Alexander. Upon his entrance into Persia, Alexander received

offer of guidance (Plutarch Alex. 37) from a man who was bilingual—that is, who knew Greek and Persian—having a Lycian father and a Persian mother. Since this man's father was a Lycian, no doubt he spoke Lycian also; but Greek and Persian were the languages he needed in his services, and so were vividly in the mind of Plutarch, who narrates the incident. For this reason Alexander's biographer ignores the man's knowledge of Lycian and does not call him trilingual.

As we follow Alexander in his successful career, we find that the mother and the wife of Darius had fallen into his hands and were wrongly informed that Darius had been killed (Curtius 3.12.6). Thereupon with the other captives of the nobility they raised great cries and lamentations and disturbed the Macedonians at their banquet. On discovering the cause of their grief, Alexander sent Mithrenes, who had surrendered Sardis, to console them. Mithrenes is a Persian name; we may therefore suppose that, in comforting these women, Mithrenes spoke his native language. When Quintus Curtius specifically notes that he was skilled in the Persian language, he is simply speaking from the Greek standpoint, meaning that he could speak a language unknown to Alexander. He hardly implies by the expression that he spoke Greek or some other tongue as his vernacular and later on acquired an idiomatic knowledge of Persian.

Alexander also had Asiatic troops in his service and had to address them by means of an interpreter (Curtius 10.3.5-6). This man doubtless spoke Persian to the soldiers, as that was the language known to the largest number.

In his expeditions into some of the remote provinces of the Great King, Alexander also had to use special linguists, although our authorities do not always state clearly whether these spoke Persian or the dialect of the country. During his invasion of the land of the Mardians, a land bordering upon Hyrcania, his horse Bucephalus was stolen by the natives. Accordingly, being transported with rage and grief, he ordered search to be made for his steed and had it announced by an interpreter (Curtius 6.5.19; Diodorus Siculus 17.76) that, if the Mardians did not restore the charger, not one of them should live. This declaration so terrified them that they not only restored the horse, but also gave Alexander presents as well. Probably the Mardians spoke a dialect closely resembling Persian; since they were under the influence of Persia's power, it is probable also that many of the Mardians had an acquaintance with Persian. In this case, an interpreter making Alexander's proclamation in the Persian tongue would have no difficulty in being understood. On the other hand, it is very probable that the announcement was made in the dialect of the country, especially if Diodorus Siculus is speaking accurately when he says in his narrative of the incident (17.76), *διὰ δὲ τῶν ὁμοφύλων τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις κηρύττειν*. It is possible, however, that he is speaking loosely and means Persian merely.

Again, Alexander's use of interpreters in Sogdiana is mentioned. Among the captives taken in this country were thirty of the highest nobility, men of remarkable bodily strength. When led before the king and informed in their own language (Curt. 7.10. ff.) that they were by his order condemned to death, they began to sing a song of a joyous strain, and with dances and wanton motions of the body to express cheerfulness of mind. Alexander, struck by their conduct, asked them how they could be so joyful when they had death before their eyes. They replied that, if they had been killed by any other, they would have died in sorrow; but now, since they were to be restored to their ancestors by so great a king, the conqueror of all nations, they celebrated with these songs an honorable death—a death which brave men would seek most eagerly. After pledging fidelity with their lives, they were released. Now Sogdiana had long been under Persian influence; for we find in the Behistūn inscription that it formed a part of the realm of Darius. Probably the people of this province spoke a dialect resembling Persian; and Persian may have been fairly well known. At any rate, we should expect the nobility to know the language of the ruling country, which makes it probable that the interpreters on this occasion spoke Persian and Greek.

Still it appears that Alexander had a man who could speak the local dialect of Sogdiana. Alexander received news that Spitamenes was besieging those whom he had left as a garrison at Maracanda, in Sogdiana. He dispatched troops there, among them fifteen hundred mercenary footsoldiers, over whom he placed Pharnuches, the interpreter, who, though by birth a Lycian, was skilled in the language of the barbarians of the country, and in other respects appeared clever in dealing with them. It is possible that Arrian (Anab. 4.3) refers to the particular dialect of the region when he speaks of Pharnuches as *ἰωνίων τῆς φωνῆς τῶν ταῦτην βαρβάρων ξόντα*. An intermediary who spoke Persian in his negotiations with the Mardians and the Sogdians doubtless had to use many colloquial and provincial expressions. But, since professional linguists usually came from the lower ranks of the people, Alexander's interpreters probably could not in any case speak the best Persian; if so, the provincials had less difficulty in understanding them. Probably the natives of the Persian provinces could understand good Persian as well as the Pennsylvania-Germans can understand a sermon delivered in literary German. If a man speaking Persian was understood by the Armenian women, it is reasonable to suppose that Persian was understood by the Mardians and the people of Sogdiana, especially by the latter.

Let us now turn to the communication of Alexander with the Indians. When the Indian Hephaestion approached Alexander the Great with the intention of surrendering all his forces, Alexander, thinking that he came as an enemy, prepared for battle. When the Indian saw the error of the Macedonians, he ordered the rest to halt and himself rode rapidly toward the

Greek, who also advanced to meet him. From the expression on the faces of both, it could be seen that they were friends; they could not, however, make themselves understood without an interpreter (Curt. 8.12.9). When one was brought, the Indian addressed Alexander.

Alexander used intermediaries also in his dealings with the Hindu philosophers. Some of the sages are said to have been taken prisoners by the Macedonian, as they were walking in the open meadow where they were accustomed to spend their time. At the sight of him and his army, they did nothing but stamp their feet on the earth. When he asked by means of interpreters (Arrian, Anab. 7.1) what their actions meant, they replied: 'King Alexander, every man possesses as much of the earth as this upon which we have stepped; but you, being only a man like the rest of us, except in being meddlesome and arrogant, have come over so great a part of the earth from your own land, both having trouble yourself and giving it to others. And yet you will also soon die, and possess only so much of the soil as is sufficient for burying your body'.

As a matter of fact, in the account of Alexander's dealings with these wise men of India, we find a reference to a series of interpreters (Strabo 15.1.64, 716 C), so that the words of the speaker were translated, then re-translated and re-re-translated. He had sent Onesicritus to confer with the ascetics; and one of them, Mandanis by name, addressed Onesicritus. The Indian said that he was entitled to indulgence, if he was not able to demonstrate the utility of philosophy, when conversing by means of *three interpreters*, who except the language know no more than the vulgar. To attempt it, he maintained, was to expect water to flow pure through mud. Doubtless Alexander conferred with the Brahmins more than once by this means.

The use of a series of interpreters is not unheard of at the present time. A modern parallel is found in Mary Blair Beebe's article Wild Burma, Harper's Magazine, April, 1912, pages 759 ff. She had taken a trip into the hills and wilds of Upper Burma, where a certain Mr. W— was to study the pheasants in their native wilds. They were accompanied by a native Mohammedan, who acted as cook, and by their factotum Aladdin, who had been their interpreter and general pilot on several previous trips. On a certain stage of their journey, Mr. W— and the lady decided to go on and leave the pack train to follow. Accordingly they set out, taking with them a Burmese boy whom they had engaged to act as interpreter among the hill people into whose country they were going. This boy knew no English, but, since the cook spoke a little Burmese, they hoped that their ideas might pass first to Aladdin, from him through the cook to the Burmese boy, and eventually to the Kachins.

After having been so long in an oriental environment, naturally the thoughts of Alexander's men would

frequently turn toward home. After being absent from one's native land for a long time, a person experiences a thrill of joy at the sight of a compatriot and the sound of his mother tongue in an unexpected place (Arrian, *Indica* 33). When Nearchus, the admiral of Alexander, was cruising along the coast of the Persian Gulf, he landed at a town called Harmozia, at the mouth of the river Anamis, in a pleasant and agreeable country. Here, going on shore, the men gladly refreshed themselves after so many hard labors, and joyfully reflected that the various misfortunes which they had encountered during the voyage were now past. Some of them, leaving their companions, wandered into the country as their fancies directed them, and there met a man dressed like a Greek. At the sight of him they could not refrain from tears; so strange and unexpected a thing it was for them to see one of their own countrymen and to hear their own language spoken. They asked him from what place he had come and who he was. He replied that he had wandered from Alexander's camp, and that the king and his army were not far distant. He was thereupon conducted before Nearchus with great manifestations of joy on the part of his guides and informed him that the king and his army were encamped about five days' journey from the sea.

From this survey of the *Anabasis* of Xenophon and the records of Alexander, we see that linguists were in constant use in these two expeditions. Interpreters were doubtless used on many occasions where they are not mentioned by our authorities. The historian is concerned with events and with their causes and effects. For him, the ideas expressed by men in their speeches are of more importance than the languages in which they were uttered and the means by which differences of language were overcome. Probably the writers of these accounts did not think of the attendant difficulties when they were absorbed in the main purpose of their work. Yet occasionally they became aware of the difficulties of communication. Sometimes the use of intermediaries gave rise to a very interesting episode; in other cases the use of the interpreter was too prominent to be overlooked; and these two features of the matter have saved to us some scattered references to the institution of interpreters, which might otherwise almost fail of mention in our classical literatures.

HILL SCHOOL,
POTTSSTOWN, PA.

HENRY S. GEHMAN.

REVIEWS

The Principles of Greek Art. By Percy Gardner. New York: The Macmillan Company (1914). Pp. xvii + 352. 112 illustrations. \$2.25.

Professor Gardner's *The Principles of Greek Art* is an expansion of his *A Grammar of Greek Art*, which appeared in 1905¹. According to the preface

¹ This book was reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 1.60-61, by Dr. T. L. Shear.

Chapters I-XII, XVIII, XXI have been mostly rewritten, IV and XI being quite new. The other chapters have been revised and corrected. Twenty-five new illustrations are added, and the bulk of the book increased by about a third. The title is altered from *Grammar to Principles*, as I found that the former title was misunderstood.

In this statement Professor Gardner fairly sets forth the differences between the two editions. It might be added, however, that the sixteen chapters of the Grammar, by a process of combination or distribution, as the case may be, have been increased to twenty-one. By this change the material in the book has become more accessible. It may be suggested, nevertheless, that the development of the writer's ideas would have been carried out more logically if Chapters III and IV, which deal respectively with The Temple and The House and the Tomb, had been placed after those dealing with sculpture. In this way the first two chapters, which are concerned primarily with sculpture, would lead directly to their natural sequence, Chapters V-XI, which deal wholly with sculpture.

In certain places Professor Gardner is misleading. For instance, on page 184, he states that the red-figured style of vase-painting was "just coming in" toward the close of the sixth century B.C. This is hardly accurate, for we know that this manner of painting was in use toward the beginning of the last quarter of the sixth century B.C. Further, in reference to ceramics, it is certainly unsafe to say (218), that the vases "were made for decoration, rather than for use". As a matter of fact the appearance of the various forms in the pictures on the vases themselves shows that the vases *were* in common use in Athens. Again, it is hardly fair to speak of the style of ware which has always been called 'Cyrenaic' as "Spartan" without some explanation of the use of the latter name. The recent work of the English at Sparta may lend some color to the use of the name 'Spartan', since many 'Cyrenaic' fragments were found there: but a later find elsewhere might easily make the name something else.

It may also fairly be asked if it is true "that of all classes of Greek remains coins are the most trustworthy, give us the most precise information, introduce us to the greatest variety of facts" (324). To the writer at least it seems self-evident that the testimony of the vases is quite as trustworthy as that of the coins.

It is also misleading to say (336) that "in delicacy of aesthetic perception . . . of the suitability of a musical note they [the Greeks] excelled beyond compare". Scanty remains of Greek musical notation, to be sure, have come down to us, and we have considerable literary testimony as to ancient music: but both taken together are insufficient to allow us to form an adequate idea of how Greek music sounded.

Space does not allow the writer to give a detailed discussion of all the debatable points in the book, but a few may be here cited.

For example "the fighting warriors of Scopas" are spoken of (24) as if we were positive that we know them; and the Tholos at Epidaurus is described as surprisingly beautiful (51), though only the foundations exist. Furthermore, it is confusing to find the author stating on page 167 that not many ancient portraits are Greek originals, though on 165 he had written that "the Greek artists of the third and second centuries have bequeathed to us a magnificent series of portraits, some of the very highest class", and that Greek portraits are to be counted "by the thousand".

On the other hand, the book contains much that is good. For instance, it contains a good discussion of ancient sources, a good description of the purpose of the temple, an excellent discussion of idealism in Greek art, and an intelligent appreciation of the aim of Greek sculpture. Particularly sane is the chapter on painting.

In view of Professor Gardner's unquestioned authority as a classical scholar it may seem captious to note the faults cited above. But it seems to the writer unfortunate that a book so inspiring and so rich in suggestion should be marred by misleading statements.

Such a book as this is needed for the study of Greek life. Whereas most writers on ancient art present their facts from an historical point of view, Professor Gardner has given us the philosophy and the essence of the subject.

VASSAR COLLEGE

OLIVER TONKS.

The Two Great Republics, Rome and the United States. By James Hamilton Lewis. Rand, McNally, and Company (1913). Pp. 304. \$1.00.

It is peculiarly fitting that a senator of the United States should publish this volume, and acknowledge once more the indebtedness of our nation to ancient Rome. Mr. Lewis has done this gracefully and effectively. My own interests have, on the historical side, turned in the same direction, and I am particularly glad of this reenforcement. Perhaps we shall not find Mr. Lewis a Sir James Bryce, a Lord Cromer, or a Sir Archibald Geikie, but for all that his book reflects great credit on him.

Mr. Lewis very properly regards the history of the Roman Republic as a most valuable subject for the student or historian of republican institutions, and believes that Americans should study it mainly for the lessons it can teach us. He is constantly impressed with the resemblances between the political organization of the Romans and our own. While he is hopeful for the future of America, he sees signs that the same causes that produced the fall of Rome are at work here today. These causes were the unequal distribution of wealth, and, consequently, of political power; the activity of demagogues; and the lack of a representative system. He traces the workings of these causes through a series of chapters which give very briefly the internal history of the Republic. Mr. Lewis realizes the danger that a modern historian will be influenced

in his treatment of Roman history by his own political views, and tries—not with perfect success—to escape it. His hero appears to be Tiberius Gracchus. He condemns Octavius as a traitor, and finds his recall (Mr. Lewis uses the word: compare my paper on this and similar episodes in *The Classical Journal* 9.44 ff.) a most fitting occasion for the first recorded application of that principle. With the historians who call Gracchus a demagogue Mr. Lewis has no sympathy, but groups them with those who defend the Bourbon misrule in France and pity Louis XVI. He examines at some length the career of Gracchus, and finds that in seeking reelection he violated no law, as none ever existed which prohibited it. In this, as in some other points, Mr. Lewis does not agree with the prevailing opinion. Caius Gracchus does not fare so well. The mainspring of his conduct, says Mr. Lewis, was his desire to avenge his brother. Carbo is singled out as a typical demagogue, the study of whose career will help us to identify the same type now. Pompey represents the best type of aristocrat. Cicero's consulship was not very creditable to him, except for his suppression of the conspiracy of Catiline. Caesar is unsparingly condemned (239):

Caesar, by the accidental course of events, became allied with the popular party at Rome, but throughout his whole life it was with him merely a case of using the popular favor as a means to promote his personal ends; never a case of sacrificing himself, his ambition, or his pleasure for the people's welfare.

These accidents began with the marriage of Julia and Marius and that of Caesar with the daughter of Cinna. Presumably his defiance of Sulla was accidental. Caesar was not a constructive statesman, but merely a hypocritical demagogue of the worst type. The good results from the establishment of the empire have been much exaggerated by imperialistic historians of the type of Hirschfeld. The improvement in the condition of the provinces must have been slight at best. The final lesson is that the remedy for the evils of liberty is more liberty.

The final chapter, entitled *The Comparison*, is the most original and valuable of all. It is a summary of the problems common to the two states. Nothing less than a full report would do Mr. Lewis justice. I know of no other place where such a list is available. His items differ greatly in importance, but no reader can fail to be struck with the close resemblance between conditions then and now. It is to be regretted that the scope of the work did not permit the consideration of the early Empire with its multitude of social and economic parallels. Classical scholars will correct the occasional errors in fact and the few misprints, will, make the slight changes in conclusions thus compelled, and find a great deal that is valuable and suggestive. Non-classical readers will not be troubled by the errors, and can hardly escape being impressed by Mr. Lewis's comparison, which will be all the more influential, coming from such a source. The book should stimulate interest in Roman history, studied in the way Mr.

Lewis would have it studied. For my own part, I am glad that some of our Colleges are now offering courses where the emphasis is laid on this aspect of Roman history.

No element in our society should be as much interested in Roman history as our statesmen. We hope that Mr. Lewis's studies will be continued, and that his example will be often followed. It is a matter for congratulation that the Senator from Illinois should have found time for classical studies, and have put them forth so attractively. We have found in Mr. Lewis a welcome ally.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURG

EVAN T. SAGE.

Stories of Old Greece and Rome. By Emilie Kip Baker. New York: The Macmillan Co. (1913). Pp. xii + 382. \$1.50.

It is part of the deathless magic of classic myths that people should not only desire to hear them but should desire to tell them as well. And so they have been told, over and over again, each telling colored somewhat by the personality of the teller and by his conception of the needs of his audience. In modern times many of the tellings have been directed more or less definitely toward an audience of children, with some idea of combining instruction with entertainment in the form of 'supplementary reading' for schools. To this class of books the volume before us seems to belong. It is well printed and attractively bound, with numerous illustrations, reproduced from both ancient and modern sources. One is inclined to question whether the introduction of the latter group is altogether happy. Such illustrations always suffer from comparison, and there is no lack of authentic ancient sculptures, wall paintings, etc., with which to illustrate the tales just as they were illustrated for the children of ancient times. If modern material is to be used at all, its selection might better be left to the teacher, who could show the children his favorites in that field now and then without keeping them permanently before their eyes in the book itself.

The myths treated in this volume include, of course, the "Beginning", very briefly told, and the more important incidents in the lives of the Great Gods and the most famous heroes. A chapter on Minor Deities (200-211) and one on Famous Lovers (93-106) introduce some tales less often told, perhaps, and the treatment of the myths as a whole is rather more detailed than we are wont to find in books of this sort. A goodly number of cross-references helps, also, to relate the myths one to another. Many of these references are to the Appendix, which occupies 48 pages and presents a good deal of information in a somewhat chaotic but rather accessible form. This information includes references to the appearance of the myths in art and literature (often with quotations), supplementary details or different versions of the myths themselves, and occasionally a vague allusion to the supposed origin of some cult. Very few references to original

sources are given, a fact to be regretted. A competent index (8 pages) adds to the usability of the books.

The brief table of Greek and Roman Names of Deities (pages xi-xii), however, is likely to bring more confusion than comfort to the reader, since it does not make clear which names are Latin and which are Greek, but merely gives a list of names (Latin, for the most part, but not exclusively Latin) each followed by one or more names or epithets in parenthesis, some of them Latin, some of them Greek, and some of them neither, it would seem. Probably "Pherephatta" is an attempt at Φερέφαττα or Φερόφαττα, and "Oneicopompus" at Ονειροπούτος, but there seems no good reason for introducing in a book of this sort such uncommon names for Proserpina and Mercury, even if they should be correctly spelled. And when we come to poor Pan bearing in his single person the whole weight of "Consentes", we feel moved to protest.

In the tone of the stories, too, I cannot help feeling a certain lack. It is true, as said above, that each telling of the myths must be colored in a measure by the medium through which it passes and must be modified by the character of the audience to which it is addressed; but there is, after all, an immutable spirit which persists through all permissible modifications, serious, poetic, playful, archaic or ultra-modern as they may be. To transmit this spirit the teller of the tale must have a real sympathy with it, and a belief in the sympathy of his auditor. It is of no use to tell a child that Aphrodite is beautiful and Heracles brave unless you yourself thrill to the thought of that beauty and bravery and expect the child to thrill to it. My own little troubled doubt, in reading this book, of the existence of the requisite sympathy may be, however, purely a matter of personal equation, and in that same category may belong an impression that the more unlovely phases of the myths, the 'unreasonable' elements, might have been made more painless if that sympathy had been all one could wish.

BARNARD COLLEGE

GRACE GOODALE.

The Teubner text-edition of Livy, by Weissenborn and Müller, goes back to 1882-1889. The first volume of an edition of Livy in the excellent Oxford Classical Text Series, covering Books 1-5, has just appeared. The editors are R. S. Conway, author of The Italic Dialects, etc., and C. F. Walters, Professor of Classics at the University of London, and formerly Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford. There is a Praefatio, of some thirty-five pages, discussing the manuscripts and the principles on which the text has been constructed. Beneath the text, itself beautifully printed, as in all the volumes of this Series, is the adequate apparatus criticus, which in some cases occupies as much as a third or a half of the page. As a text of Livy, then, this book is at once newer and far more conveniently usable than Weissenborn's. The latter book, however, will still long be of service, especially for its excellent discussion De Titi Livii Vita et Scriptis, and for its Index.

C. K.